

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action dated May 12, 2005.

The Examiner objected to claims 6 and 11 for specified informalities. Each of claims 6 and 10 have been corrected as required by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Adams et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,541,662 (hereinafter Adams). The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Adams with Harrison et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,064,420. The Examiner rejected claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Adams with Harrison et al. and Eyer, U.S. Patent No. 5,982,445.

Adams discloses an interactive video system in which respective packets containing audio, video, and associated data are transmitted to a receiver. The associated data packet 84, shown in FIG. 5 of Adams - and which the Examiner considers a document, contains a header, a field containing a time stamp, and a payload containing the data associated with the audio and/or video. The time stamp in the data packet 84 is already present in the data packet 84 when it is in a packetized elementary stream (see FIG. 5 of Adams and col. 7 lines 15-20. Thus, the data packet 84 does not include a “structure *for receiving* a first time stamp . . . *in a packetized elementary stream*.” Rather, it already includes a time stamp when it is in a packetized elementary stream.

Independent claim 1, as amended, includes the limitations of (1) “providing said document wherein said document includes a structure for receiving a first time stamp value . . . wherein the combination of said document and said structure for receiving a first time stamp value is provided in a packetized elementary stream together with an associated presentation time stamp; and (2) inserting said presentation time stamp value . . . into said structure. Thus independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Adams, which does not disclose an elementary stream containing a document with a structure for receiving a time stamp value, nor does Adams disclose the step of *inserting* a presentation time stamp value into such a structure given that the system of Adams assumes that the time stamp value is already there and hence

need not be inserted. Therefore independent claim 1, from which dependent claims 2-4 respectively depend, is patentably distinguishable over Adams and dependent claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over the combination of Adams and Harrison, et al. Therefore, the applicant requests that the Examiner's withdraw the rejection of claims 1-5.

With respect to independent claims 6 and 11, the Examiner indicated that if a limitation were added of "a payload with a structure for receiving a first time stamp value" then each of these claims would be patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record. Independent claim 6, as amended, includes the limitations of "encoding in a packetized elementary stream a first data packet comprising a payload containing said document" where the document "includes a structure for receiving a first time stamp value." Similarly, independent claim 11, as amended, includes the limitations of a "packet assembler for encoding in a packetized elementary stream a "first data packet having, together with an associated presentation time stamp, a payload comprising a data unit representing said document" where the document "includes a structure for receiving a first time stamp value." Thus each of independent claims 6 and 11, as amended, specifies that a payload includes a structure for receiving a first time stamp value. Therefore, each of claims 6 and 11, as well as their respective dependent claims 7-10 and 12-14, patentably distinguish over the prior art of record and should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-14.

Respectfully submitted,



Kurt Rohlf
Reg. No. 54,405
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631